



2026:AHC:10464

HIGH COURT OF JUDICATURE AT ALLAHABAD

WRIT - A No. - 402 of 2026

Radheshyam Chauhan

.....Petitioner(s)

Versus

State Of U.P. And 2 Others

.....Respondent(s)

Counsel for Petitioner(s)	:	Munib Singh Chauhan
Counsel for Respondent(s)	:	C.S.C.

Court No. - 33

HON'BLE VIKAS BUDHWAR, J.

1. Heard Sri Munib Singh Chauhan, learned counsel for the petitioner and Sri Prashant Kumar Mishra, learned Standing Counsel, who appears for State-respondents.
2. The case of the writ petitioner is that he was engaged as a part time tube-well operator on 07.04.1985 and he was made regular on 10.03.1998. The writ petitioner claims promotion on the post of Zileदार. The writ petitioner had earlier approached this Court while filing Writ-A No. 6760 of 2025 for grant of increments and arrears of salary. It is also the case of the writ petitioner is that since 31.07.2025, the writ petitioner is working as Acting Irrigation Officer. The writ petitioner claims promotion against the two posts which are lying vacant.
3. Prayer in the present petition is for a direction to the respondents to consider the claim.
4. Learned Standing Counsel submits that the claim of the writ petitioner needs adjudication at the first instance by the third respondent, Executive Engineer, Irrigation Department, (Nalkoop Khand), Mau, District Mau.
5. To such a submission, learned counsel for the petitioner has no objection and he gracefully accepts the same.
6. Considering the submissions of the rival parties as well as stand taken by them, the writ petition is being **disposed off** granting liberty to the writ petitioner to prefer a comprehensive representation along with the self-attested copy of the writ petition before the third respondent, who shall on

the receipt of the same within a period of two weeks, proceed to decide the claim of the petitioner strictly in accordance with law within a period of two months from the date of presentation of the certified copy of the order. In case the third respondent is of the opinion that the matter is to be decided by some other authorities then the papers shall be transmitted to the same.

7. It is open for the writ petitioner to also correspond and make request for payment of other allowances also.

8. Needless to point out that the writ petition has been decided without seeking any response from the respondents. Thus, passing of this order may not be construed to an expression that this Court has gone into the merits of the case.

9. With the aforesaid observation, the writ petition is **disposed off**.

January 16, 2026

A. Prajapati

(Vikas Budhwar,J.)